



# राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

## हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

बुधवार, 26 अप्रैल, 2023 / 06 वैशाख, 1945

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

*Dated the 17th April, 2023*

**No. Shram (A) 6-2/2020 (Awards) Dharamshala.**—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased

to order the publication of awards of the following cases announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Kangra at Dharamshala on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh *i.e.* “e-Gazette” :—

Sl. No.	Ref. No.	Petitioner	Respondent	Date of Award/Order
1.	207/17	Manoj Kumar	M/s Amar Ujala	22-02-2023
2.	206/17	Suresh Kumar	M/s Amar Ujala	22-02-2023
3.	191/14	Anil Kumar	Vice Chancellor/Registrar CSK, HPKV, Palampur.	20-02-2023

By order,

AKSHAY SOOD,  
*Secretary (Lab. & Emp.).*

**IN THE COURT OF HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Ref. No. : 207/2017

Date of Institution : 06-11-2017

Date of Decision : 22-02-2023

Shri Manoj Kumar s/o Shri Pritam Chand, r/o Village Barai, P.O. Suned, Tehsil Nagrota Bagwan, District Kangra, H.P. *..Petitioner.*

*Versus*

M/s Amar Ujala Publications Ltd., Plot No. 22-23, Industrial Area, Nagrota Bagwan, Tehsil Nagrota Bagwan, District Kangra, H.P. *..Respondent.*

**Reference under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the petitioner : Petitioner in person with Sh. Ravinder Aggarwal, Ld. AR

For the respondent : Sh. Naresh Kumar, Assistant Manager with Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR

**AWARD**

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:

“Whether employer-employee relationship existed between the applicant/claimant and management ever?” If Yes.

“Whether applicant/claimant is entitled to the amount of Rs.17,02,779/- as claimed by him from the management under the Majithia Wage Board?”

2. The parties have entered in a compromise and as per the petitioner as well as authorized representative of the respondent the matter has been settled between them by way of compromise and the cause of action claimed in this reference does not survive for further determination. Statements of the petitioner as well as authorized representative of the respondent recorded separately. In view of the compromise and the statements of the parties recorded separately the reference is answered to the effect that the cause between the parties has projected in this reference does not survive and no further action is required in this reference. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 22nd day of February, 2023.

Sd/-  
(HANS RAJ),  
*Presiding Judge,*  
*Labour Court-cum-Industrial.*  
*Tribunal, Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.*

**IN THE COURT OF HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Ref. No. : 206/2017  
Date of Institution : 06-11-2017  
Date of Decision : 22-02-2023

Shri Suresh Kumar s/o Shri Amar Nath, r/o V.P.O. Jalot, Tehsil Nagrota Bagwan, District Kangra, H.P. *..Petitioner.*

*Versus*

M/s Amar Ujala Publications Ltd., Plot No. 22-23, Industrial Area, Nagrota Bagwan, Tehsil Nagrota Bagwan, District Kangra, H.P. *..Respondent.*

**Reference under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the petitioner : Petitioner in person with Sh. Ravinder Aggarwal, Ld. AR  
For the respondent : Sh. Naresh Kumar, Assistant Manager with Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR

**AWARD**

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:

“Whether employer-employee relationship existed between the applicant/claimant and management ever? If Yes.

“Whether applicant/claimant is entitled to the amount of Rs.17,02,779/- as claimed by him from the management under the Majithia Wage Board?”

2. The parties have entered in a compromise and as per the petitioner as well as authorized representative of the respondent the matter has been settled between them by way of compromise and the cause of action claimed in this reference does not survive for further determination. Statements of the petitioner as well as authorized representative of the respondent recorded separately. In view of the compromise and the statements of the parties recorded separately, the reference is answered to the effect that the cause between the parties as projected in this reference does not survive and no further action is required in this reference. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 22nd day of February, 2023.

Sd/-  
(HANS RAJ),  
*Presiding Judge,*  
*Labour Court-cum-Industrial,*  
*Tribunal, Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.*

---

**IN THE COURT OF HANS RAJ, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Ref. No. : 191/2014

Date of Institution : 02-5-2014

Date of Decision : 20-02-2023

Shri Anil Kumar s/o Shri Kehar Singh, r/o Village Dandeil, P.O. Dhupkyara, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, H.P. *..Petitioner.*

*Versus*

Vice Chancellor/Registrar, Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishav-Vidhyalya (CSKHPKV), Palampur, District Kangra, H.P. *..Respondent.*

**Reference under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the petitioner : Sh. N.L.Kaundal, Ld. AR  
: Sh. Rajat Chaudhary, Ld. Adv.

For the respondent

: Smt. Rajni Katoch, Ld. Adv.

## AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short).

“Whether termination of the services of Sh. Anil Kumar s/o Sh. Kehar Singh, Village Dandeil, P.O. Dhupkyara, Tehsil Palampur, Distt. Kangra, H.P. by the Vice Chancellor/Registrar, CSKHPKV, Palampur, District Kangra, (H.P.) or by the concerned Contractor, as alleged by the above employers, during March/April 2010, without following the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above workman is entitled to from the above employer(s)/university?”

2. The case of the petitioner, in brief, is to the effect that his services were engaged as daily waged worker on daily rated basis by the respondent *w.e.f.* 01.05.1998 in Vegetable Department without issuing him the appointment letter, identity card and casual attendance card. A Union was formed by the workmen in the name and style of H.P. Krishi Vishvavidyalaya Mazdoor Sangh in the year 2008 and certain demands were raised in the welfare of workmen. Conciliation took place in the matter but the demands were not accepted by the officers of the respondent. The appropriate Government made a reference on the demand charter raised in the year 2009 by the Union. Around 200 workmen were terminated by the respondent after the reference. The reference was withdrawn by the Union on some technical grounds. The petitioner and other workmen were asked to join in the rolls of contractor namely M/s. Sahayta Security Services Private Ltd. in the year 2010 and on their refusal, the Head of Department unlawfully terminated the services of the petitioner despite of the fact that his work was thoroughly satisfactory and there was nothing against him. Neither any show cause notice nor any charge-sheet were served upon him. His services were terminated in clear cut violation of the provisions contained in Section 25-F of the Act. After the year 2010, the respondent employed the labour through various contractors such as M/s Sahayta Security, M/s. Sun Security Services Private Limited and M/s Nue Vision Shimla. The petitioner also joined the contractor on 18.7.2011 as per the interim order of the court and has been worked through contractor till date. One Smt. Promila Devi d/o Shri Shali Ram was engaged for 89 days in January, 2000 on contractual basis by the respondent and her services were regularized whereas, the services of the petitioner were terminated without any lawful reason. On such averments the petitioner has prayed for his reinstatement with full back wages *w.e.f.* 2010 to 17.7.2011 with seniority and all benefits and regularization of his services in the same manner as the services of Miss Promila Devi were regularized.

3. The respondent has resisted and contested the petition on the plea of maintainability, locus standi and that the petitioner has not approached the court with clean hands as well suppressed the material facts. On merits it is averred that as per policy of the Government of H.P. of Finance Department vide order No. FIN.1-C(14)-1/83, dated 8.7.1998, the policy/system to engage the worker on muster roll basis stood banned. It was further averred in the petition that the petitioner was never engaged as a daily paid labourer on muster roll basis, but he was engaged on work contract basis in the month of July, 2000, for which he had been raising bills for the work performed and had been paid at the rate not below the Government rate by the Project Investigators of the Project/HOD. His wages were paid from the funds of the project funded by ICAR/GOI and no wages had ever been paid to him from the Grant-in-Aid of the university. Had the petitioner been engaged as a daily paid labourer on muster roll basis, his name would have figured in the seniority lists of daily paid labourers of the university circulated in 2006 and 2008. It is averred that

the activities carried out by the respondent are purely of scientific research nature and do not have a motive of gain or profit. The petitioner had never worked against any sanctioned post in the university. The tender to outsource the workers was floated by the department of Soil Science of the respondents university and tender of M/s. Sahayata Security Services was approved. The services of the labourers/workers were outsourced to the said agency. Prior to it work was got done from unregistered contractors. It is specifically denied that the petitioner had never been allowed to enter the premises of the department by the HOD and his services had been unlawfully terminated. The worker had not turned to seek work from the respondents university at his own will. He had worked on Individual Work Contractor/unregistered contractor from July, 2000 upto February, 2009. He raised various bills from time to time. The head of department had not violated any provisions of the Act. The petitioner did not come to attend his work at his own, as he was not interested to work as a labourer. The Director of Research of the respondents had not offered any appointment to any of the workers. Reference No.207/2010 was dismissed as withdrawn. It had been instituted by using false registration number, which had been issued to Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya Dhiadidar Mazdoor Sangh. Registered contractors, namely, M/s. Sahayata Security Services, M/s. Sun Securities Services Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Nuvision had been hired by the university for outsourcing of labour for various works related with research and scientific purposes. The deployment had been made for seasonal work, as per the requirement of the work. The petitioner had been deployed in various adhoc projects as per the requirement of the project work. The HOD concerned used to verify the work done, monthly attendance and wages bill raised by the Contractor/individual concerned, to see that excess payments were not made. The petitioner had been paid from recurring contingencies sub head and on the termination of one project, he had worked in other similar projects from time to time. He is not a regular employee of the university. The petitioner is said to have been working through contractor in the Research Project for which specific funds are sanctioned by the Government and the respondent had no role in the same. Smt. Promila Devi is said to have been appointed as Data Entry Operator on contractual basis initially and her services were regularized on the basis of the policy framed by the Government of H.P, hence, there was no similarity in between the case of petitioner and Smt. Promila Devi. The petitioner and other workers are said to have been engaged in pursuant to the interim order dated 14.7.2011 through contractor and there is no direct appointment. The petitioner is said to be not entitled for the relief as claimed by him. It is submitted that the claim petition be dismissed.

4. The petitioner has filed the rejoinder and re-affirmed the averments made in the petition and denied those made in the reply.

5. From the pleadings of the parties and keeping in mind the language of the reference received, following issues were framed on 21.09.2021 for determination:—

1. Whether termination of services of petitioner by the respondent during March/April, 2010 is/was illegal and unjustified, as alleged? ..OPP.
2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative, to what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the petitioner is entitled to from the employer/university? .. OPP.
3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable? .. OPR.
4. Whether the petitioner has no locus standi and cause of action to file the present petition? .. OPR.
5. Whether the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands and has suppressed true and material facts, as alleged. If so, its fact?

## 6. Relief.

6. I have heard learned Authorized Representative/counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the respondents at length and considered the material on record.

7. For the reasons recorded hereinafter, the findings of this Court on the above issues are as under:—

Issue No.1	: Negative
Issue No.2	: Negative
Issue No.3	: Yes
Issue No.4	: Yes
Issue No.5	: Yes
Relief	: Petition is dismissed per operative portion of the Award.

## REASONS FOR FINDINGS

*ISSUE No.1*

8. The main dispute raised in this case is with regard to the status of the petitioner. The petitioner claims himself as daily paid labourer engaged on muster roll basis by the respondents *w.e.f.* 1st May, 1998 to April 2010, whereas, the respondents have come up with the case that the petitioner was never engaged as daily paid labourer in May, 1998 as claimed by him. The further case of the respondent is to the effect that there are several projects executed by the university and these projects are time bound as well as separate funds are received for these projects. As per the respondent, the moment project comes to an end the workmen engaged for the same on contract system can not claim any right as projects are for definite period and once the project is over everything ends. The respondents have thus come up with the case that petitioner was engaged for the first time in July, 2004 in a project as contract labour and he worked under different contracts and his status has never been of on daily paid labourer on muster roll. He has no right whatsoever which he could claim under the Industrial Disputes Act. It is in the aforesaid background that the evidence led by the parties need deeper examination before any conclusion can be arrived at.

9. Several documents have been tendered on record by the parties and the correctness of these documents is not in dispute, hence, the documents can be safely relied upon by this court in order to arrive at any conclusion. The petitioner has tendered on record notification dated 13.11.1998 as Ext.PW1/C. This document is very material. As per the is document, the respondents had adopted the Himachal Pradesh Government (Finance Department) letter No.Fin.-1-C(14)-1/03, dated 8.7.1998 whereby it was decided that no daily paid labourer shall be appointed and engaged and the works shall be done through contractual system. This document was adopted by the respondents vide letter Ext.PW1/C, dated 13.11.1998. It is therefore clear from this document that the respondents has decided *w.e.f.* 13.1.1998 to not to employ any daily paid labourer in the university and, in case, any projects were undertaken or there was requirement of labour, the contractual system shall be followed and rest of the modalities shall be formulated by the university itself. There is another letter dated 8th July 1998 Ext.PW1/B. This letter was received from Finance Department by the Vice Chancellor of the university and vide this letter it was intimated that a complete ban was imposed on filing of the post by direct recruitment and the practice of filling of

vacant post by engaging person on contract, adhoc, daily wage or on part-time basis with the concurrence of the finance department was to be followed. This letter also shows that the matter regarding not engaging daily paid labourer was seriously agitated in the year 1998 itself and decisions were principally taken to not to engage daily paid labourer. This decision was also taken by the respondents university. In this background the petitioner has pleaded in the claim that he was engaged *w.e.f.* 1.5.1998. The petitioner has pleaded this date with a view to come out of the scope of the aforesaid letters. It is thus for the petitioner to prove that he was engaged *w.e.f.* 1.5.1998 on daily wages on muster roll basis by the respondents. The petitioner has not placed on record any documents which would suggest that he was engaged on 1.5.1998 on daily wages basis. The petitioner though could not have possessed any document being the labourer yet he could have summoned muster rolls of the respondent department starting from 1.5.1998 so that his name would have figured anywhere in those muster rolls. He could have examined any witness in support of his case who was working *w.e.f.* 1.5.1998 or prior to this as daily paid labourer. Had the petitioner led evidence to this extent, the onus would have shifted upon the respondent to prove the contrary. The petitioner has not led any evidence except for his self serving statement. This statement is not sufficient to prove the case of the petitioner. In case, the petitioner was engaged as daily paid labourer on 1.5.1998 by the respondent, why his muster roll shall not be prepared by the department. The petitioner has not alleged any personal bias against him by the officers of the respondents. He has not said anything as to who were other workmen working with him *w.e.f.* 1.5.1998. Since the petitioner has not led any cogent, convenience and trustworthy evidence to prove that he was engaged on 1.5.1998 as daily wage labourer, therefore, his plea on this effect is not established.

10. The respondent, as aforesaid, has come with the plea that petitioner was engaged firstly in July 2004 in a project which was for a specific time and thereafter his services were taken in other projects as well but as a contractual labourer and not as daily paid labourer. The respondent has placed on record two seniority lists of the daily paid labourer as Ext.R1 and Ext.R2. These seniority lists pertain to the year 2006 and 2008. These seniority lists pertain to daily paid workers working with the respondents as on 31.3.2006 and as on 31.3.2008. These seniority lists are very material documents and had the petitioner been engaged in the year 1998 as a daily paid labourer his name would have figured in these seniority lists by all means. The truth of the matter is that his name does not figure in these lists. The petitioner has appeared in witness box as PW1 and he was subjected to cross-examination by the respondents. The petitioner was specifically confronted with these seniority lists Ext.R1 and Ext.R2 and he admitted that he was aware of these seniority lists. He further admitted that his name did not figure anywhere in both of these lists. The petitioner was questioned as why he has not made a protest against the fact that he was not shown as daily paid labourer in the year 2006 and 2008 in the seniority lists. The petitioner could not reply the question satisfactorily but submitted that he had made oral objections to the Vice Chancellor but nothing was done. This explanation is mere excuse without anything more. In case the petitioner was daily paid labourer, when the seniority list Ext.R1 pertaining to the year 2006 was brought his notice, he would not have remained silent on finding that his name did not figure anywhere. The petitioner neither objected to the list of 2006 nor list of 2008 when he did not find his name in those lists. All these facts show that petitioner himself knew that he was not a daily paid labourer and therefore, his name would have never find mention in these seniority lists, and he therefore, he did not raise any objection either in the year 2007 or in the year 2008. This evidence goes against the petitioner and weakens his case regarding his engagement as daily paid labourer *w.e.f.* 1.5.1998.

11. The petitioner was not without any remedy when these seniority lists were shown to him. These seniority lists had been filed on the record. He would have examined these seniority lists and find the names of those workmen who were working with him. The petitioner would have examined those workmen and they would have said that they have also seen the petitioner working with them as a daily paid labourer. Otherwise also, the respondents had no reasons to ignore the



petitioner alone and prepare the list of rest of the daily paid labourers. The petitioner has nowhere attributed any motive or ill will on the part of the officers or officials of the respondent university to harm him. These facts go against the petitioner and it is not established that the petitioner was engaged as daily paid labourer on 1.5.1998 and he had worked in the same capacity till April 2010 when he claims that his services were terminated without any show cause notice.

12. There are other documents on the record which are very material for the just decision of this case. The petitioner has himself tendered on record copy of the bill Ext.PW1/N pertaining to July 2000. It is very much clear from this document that the petitioner was working on contractual basis in NATP project with other labourers and he was paid consolidated amount. Though the number of working days have also been mentioned in this bill yet it will not make the petitioner as daily paid labourer when he has been working on a specific project which was only for time being and on completion of the tenure of the project the project would have come to an end. The petitioner has tendered the certificate issued to him by the HOD in the year 2014 and he has relied upon the same as Ext.PW1/O. As per this certificate, the petitioner has worked as a contractor basis labourer in NATP project though "entitled household food and nutritional security in tribal, backward and hilly areas" *w.e.f.* year 2000 to 2004. It is also mentioned in this document that he was a sincere worker. Had the petitioner been a daily paid labourer when he would have obtained a certificate from the HOD of Crop Improvement and relied the same before this court. It means that the petitioner knew that he had worked in this project *w.e.f.* year 2000 to 2004 and he was not a daily paid labourer working under muster roll. The petitioner has tendered on record another document Ext. PW1/P. It is an information received under RTI Act. As per this information, the petitioner has worked along with five other persons in the department of vegetable science on the project known as 'revolving fund' on some other project. In this document Ext.PW1/Q, the petitioner has been shown as having been working in February to June for few days. There is another document appended to the same showing that from July 2004 to June 2006 the petitioner has worked on cardamom project. His mandays have also been shown. It has also been clarified that the petitioner has worked on contractual basis on this specified project, and therefore, he was not entitled for paid wages, holidays etc. The intentions are very much clear from this document that the petitioner was engaged for the completion of a project that was to operate in between 2004 to June 2006 and was assigned the name as 'cardamom project'. Thereafter from August 2006 to March 2009 the petitioner has worked in another project known as Standardization of Polyhouse Technology for off season vegetable in mid Hill (Adhoc 919-20) in the department of vegetable Science. It is again very much clear from this document that from the year 2006 to 2009 no daily paid labourer was engaged against the project and project is time specified and fixed funds are allotted for the same. A workman can not work in any such project after the project has been completed. It is an understanding between employer as well as workmen that the workmen can work with the employer until the completion of the project as the project is carried out on a specified budget allocated for completion of the same and workmen are pay out of such allocated budget. Once the project is completed and very purpose of projects stand achieved, no workman can claim any right of retention in the services. The petitioner has placed on record two other documents Ext.P1 and Ext.P2 which are same and has already been discussed hereinabove.

13. The respondents have also led other documentary evidence on the record. Ext.RW1/D1 is the payment released for some project as Rs.7803/-. The petitioner is also shown to worked in the same and he has received Rs.1377/- It means a specific amount was allotted for a specific project and it was spent in the manner shown in Ext.RW1/D2. Ext.RW1/D3 is payment received by the petitioner as contractual labourer in the project. His name has also been mentioned in the same. Ex.RW1/E copy of the Award passed by this court in the year 2004 in the similar issue was involved. It is not clear whether this award has attained finality or not. Ext.RW1/F is a copy of order *vide* which reference was withdrawn. Ext.RW1/J is an applications Ext.RW1/G and H, applications of Sahayata Security for registration as agency. Ext.RW1/R are the details of the funds

deposited. It is clear from the documents prepared after 31st May 2010 that the labour for the project was deployed through outsources agency. Ext.RW1/B2 is similar letter and Ext.RW1/B1 is a statute. Ext.RW1/Q carries the name of the outsource agency and Ext. RW1/L is the agreement. These documents show that after April 2010 the work in the project was done after obtaining the labour from outsourcing agency and prior to that labour for the project was engaged directly by those who run the project and payment to the labourer was made out of the funds allocated to the project. It is also clear that on completion of the project the matter used to come to an end. The respondents has examined Shri Dinesh Kumar Vatsa as RW1 in the witness box and he has tendered on record all the documents already referred to hereinabove. He was subjected to cross-examination wherein he has stated that prior to the year 2010 unregistered contractor used to supply labour. He though could not tell the name of such unregistered contractor yet he specifically denied that petitioner was engaged in the year 1998. He has made stray admission to the effect that the petitioner was working since 1998 but this admission is not supported by any document and therefore, it can not be looked into for any purpose as it is not said by this officer that the petitioner was working under him. His stray admission can not help the petitioner in any manner when no document in support thereof has been placed on the record and the name of the petitioner is not mentioned in any of the seniority lists. There is nothing in his statement which would in any manner prove that the petitioner was engaged as daily paid labourer *w.e.f.* 1.5.1998 and he had worked in the aforesaid capacity till April 2010. Rather documentary evidence prove the case of the respondent as has already been discussed hereinabove. Therefore the petitioner is proved to have worked in different projects as labourer and once the projects were finalized the matter came to an end and no violation of the any of the provision of the Industrial Disputes Act was violated.

14. The law is well settled in several rulings of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to the effect that once any of the person works in a project and once the project is over he can not claim better right. In **Range Forest Officer vs. S.T. Hadimani, 2002 SCC (L&S) 367**, it was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that filing of an affidavit is only his own statement in his favour and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any court or tribunal to come to the conclusion that a workman had, in fact, worked for 240 days in a year. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record of appointment or engagement for this period was produced by the workman.

15. Thus for the reasons recorded hereinabove, my findings on the issue No.1 are in negative, against the petitioner and in favour of the respondents.

*Issue No.2:*

16. In view of my findings of the Issue No.1, the petitioner has no cause of action and is not proved to be a daily wages worker of the respondent and is proved to have worked on specified projects, and therefore, he cannot claim succeed. Hence, my findings on the issue No. 2 is in negative, against the petitioner and in favour of the respondents.

*Issues No. 3 & 5:*

17. In view of my findings on the above issues, it appears to me that the present petition is not maintainable. Because, the petitioner has not been shown daily wage worker. Thus, the petitioner has not come to the Court with clean hands as well as has suppressed the material facts from the court. Hence, issues No. 3 and 5 are decided in the affirmative, in favour of the respondents and against the petitioner.

*Issue No. 4:*

18. Once the petitioner is not proved to be daily wage worker, then he has not locus-standi to challenge any action of alleged retrenchment, which was never there. The petitioner has not

proved that he was retrenched in any manner from his daily wage service. Hence, my findings in the above issue in affirmative and in favour of the respondents and against the petitioner.

### RELIEF

19. In view of my above discussions, the present claim petition merits dismissal and is accordingly dismissed. Parties are left to bear their own costs.

20. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 20th day of February, 2023.

Sd/-  
(HANS RAJ),  
Presiding Judge,  
Labour Court-cum-Industrial,  
Tribunal, Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

कार्मिक विभाग  
नियुक्ति -II

अधिसूचना,

शिमला-2, 18 अप्रैल, 2023

संख्या पर. (एपी.ब)ए(1)-1 / 2022.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग (अतिरिक्त कृत्य) अधिनियम, 2018 की धारा 3 (1) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, तारीख 27 जून, 2019 की अधिसूचना संख्या पर. (एपी.ब)ए(3)-2 / 2014 को 21 फरवरी, 2023 से निरसित करने का आदेश करते हैं।

आदेश द्वारा,  
प्रबोध सक्सेना  
मुख्य सचिव

[Authoritative English text of this department notification No. Per. (AP-B)A(1)-1/2022, dated 18-04-2023, as required under Article 348(3) of the Constitution of India].

### PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

#### APPOINTMENT-II

#### NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 18th April, 2023

**No. Per. (AP-B)A(1)-1/2022.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Section 3(1) of the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission (Additional Functions) Act, 2018, the

Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order to repeal the notification No. Per. (AP.B)A(3)-2/2014, dated 27th June, 2019 with effect from 21st February, 2023.

By order,

PRABODH SAXENA,  
Chief Secretary.

कार्मिक विभाग  
नियुक्ति –II

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 18 अप्रैल, 2023

**संख्या पर (एपी.ब)ए(1)–1/2022.**—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 320 के खण्ड (3) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, अधिसूचना संख्या 2–6/71(नियुक्ति–II), तारीख 20–09–1973 द्वारा अधिसूचित और राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश (असाधारण) में तारीख 21–09–1973 को प्रकाशित दी हिमाचल प्रदेश पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन (इग्जैम्शन फॉम कंसलटेशन) रेगुलेशन, 1973 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित विनियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :-

**1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.**—(i) इन विनियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम दी हिमाचल प्रदेश पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन (इग्जैम्शन फॉम कंसलटेशन) (अमेंडमेंट) रेगुलेशन, 2023 है।

(ii) ये 21 फरवरी, 2023 से प्रवृत्त हुए समझे जाएंगे।

**2. शैड्यूल का संशोधन.**—हिमाचल प्रदेश पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन (इग्जैम्शन फॉम कंसलटेशन) रेगुलेशन, 1973 से संलग्न शैड्यूल की मद संख्या 8(i) का लोप किया जाएगा।

आदेश द्वारा,  
प्रबोध सक्सेना,  
मुख्य सचिव।

*[Authoritative English text of this department notification No. Per. (AP-B)A(1)-1/2022, dated 18-04-2023, as required under Article 348(3) of the Constitution of India].*

**PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT**  
APPOINTMENT-II

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla-2, the 18th April, 2023*

**No. Per. (AP-B)A(1)-1/2022.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to clause (3) of Article 320 of the Constitution of India, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased

to make the following regulations further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission (Exemption from Consultation) Regulations, 1973, notified *vide* notification No. 2-6/71(Apptt.II), dated 20-09-1973, as published in Government of Himachal Pradesh extra ordinary Rajpatra dated 21-09-1973, namely:—

**1. Short title and commencement.**—(i) These Regulations may be called Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission (Exemption from Consultation) (amendment) Regulations, 2023.

(ii) These shall be deemed to have come into force *w.e.f.* 21st February, 2023.

**2. Amendment of the Schedule.**— In the schedule appended to the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission (Exemption from Consultation) Regulations, 1973, the item No. 8 (i) shall be deleted .

By order,

PRABODH SAXENA,  
*Chief Secretary.*

## HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 5th April, 2023*

**No. HHC/GAZ/1-15/73-V.**—In partial modification to this Registry notification No. HHC/GAZ/1-15/73-V-6323-40, dated 14-03-2023, the super Time Scale of Rs. 199100—224100, is granted to Sh. J. K. Sharma, Registrar (Vigilance), High Court of H.P., Shimla *w.e.f.* **02-10-2022** instead of 17-08-2022 and he shall be called as “**Super Time Scale District Judge.**”

By order,

*Registrar General.*

## HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 31st March, 2023*

**No. HHC/Estt.3(553)/2004.**—04 days commuted leave *w.e.f.* 22-02-2023 to 25-02-2023 with permission to suffix Sunday on 26-02-2023 is hereby sanctioned, *ex-post-facto*, in favour of Shri Karan Singh Kanwar, Court Master of this Registry.

Certified that Shri Karan Singh Kanwar has joined the same post and at the same station from where he had proceeded on leave after the expiry of the above leave period.

Certified that Shri Karan Singh Kanwar would have continued to officiate the same post of Court Master but for his proceeding on leave.

By order,

*Registrar General.*

## HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 27th March, 2023*

#### Preface

**No. HHC/Rules/Live Streaming-23-I.**—Whereas to imbue greater transparency, inclusivity, and foster access to justice, it is expedient to set up infrastructure and the framework to enable live streaming and recording of proceedings. These Rules are framed by the High Court of Himachal Pradesh in the exercise of powers under Article 225 and Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

**Short Title, Applicability and Commencement.**—These Rules shall be called the ‘Live Streaming and Recording of Court Proceedings Rules of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, 2023’. These Rules shall apply to the High Court of Himachal Pradesh and to the Courts/Tribunals over which it has supervisory jurisdiction. These Rules will come into force from the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

#### 1. Definitions:

- i. **Archival Data:** means audio and visual data recorded during the conduct of the proceedings and retained by the Court.
- ii. **Bench:** means the Judge(s) assigned to hear the case filed before the court.
- iii. **Chief Justice:** means the Chief Justice of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, including the Acting Chief Justice.
- iv. **Communication Device:** means a hardware device capable of transmitting analog or digital signal over the telephone and other communication devices, whether wired or wireless.
- v. **Court:** means the High Court of Himachal Pradesh and/or all the courts/tribunals under its supervision under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.
- vi. **Court Master / Reader:** means the court staff that assists the court in the conduct of proceedings, including updating of the cause lists published on the display board.
- vii. **Court Premises:** means and includes buildings and complexes under the authority of courts.

- 
- viii. Designated Officer:** means the Registrar (IT) or any other officer mandated to carry out the function of granting access to copies of recordings under these rules.
  - ix. Designated Venue:** means and includes a courtroom or any other place where the proceedings are conducted, whether within the court premises or at a remote location.
  - x. Hardware:** means and includes equipment to be installed for live streaming and recording of proceedings or any ancillary activity.
  - xi. IT Committee:** means and includes a committee constituted by the Chief Justice to deal with matters concerning information and communication technology, also referred to as the High Court computer committee or e-Committee.
  - xii. Live-stream/ Live-streamed/ Live streaming:** means and includes a live television link, webcast, audio-video transmissions via electronic means or other arrangements whereby any person can view the proceedings as permitted under these rules.
  - xiii. Proceedings:** mean and include judicial proceedings, Lok Adalat proceedings, full-court references, official transfer, elevation, retirement, farewells organised by the Court.
  - xiv. Recording:** means audio and video data of proceedings stored in electronic format, whether it is live streamed or not.
  - xv. Recording Device:** means and includes a device capable of recording images or sound, including but not limited to camera, audio recorder, video recorder, mobile telephone, or screen recorder.
  - xvi. Registrar (IT):** means and includes any officer so designated by the Chief Justice of the High Court.
  - xvii. Remote Location:** means and includes a geographical location, different from the court premises, from where proceedings are conducted.
  - xviii. Transcript:** means the official written record of the proceedings published as per the directions of the court.

## 2. Hardware – Placement & Control:

- 2.1.** Cameras will be ordinarily installed in the courtroom covering atleast five angles; one towards the bench, the second and third towards the advocates engaged in the concerned matter, the fourth towards the accused (where applicable) and the fifth towards the deponent/witness, as required.
- 2.2.** If the court has employed an electronic evidence presentation system, an additional feed shall be captured therefrom.
- 2.3.** A remote-control device shall be provided to the presiding judge on the bench to pause or stop the live streaming at any time.
- 2.4.** Advocates, witnesses, accused or any other person permitted by the bench, shall use appropriate microphones while addressing the court.

- 2.5. In so far as a remote location is concerned, appropriate hardware will be deployed to the extent practicable, bearing in mind the provisions made in the aforementioned sub-rules.
- 2.6. Where proceedings are conducted through weblinks, including video conferencing services, appropriate software and hardware will be employed, if necessary, to generate an integrated feed for live streaming.

### 3. Requisitioning and Positioning of Human Resources:

- 3.1. A dedicated control room (DCR) shall be set up for every court complex.
- 3.2. The DCR shall, *inter-alia*, comprise an officer of the Court, technical and video-recording experts. The DCR will monitor and track proceedings as they are live streamed, recorded and transcribed. The DCR shall ensure that nothing uncivil or inappropriate is streamed in the public domain.
- 3.3. The coverage of Proceedings will be coordinated by the technical experts under the direct supervision of the Registrar (IT) or her/his nominee.
- 3.4. The Registrar (IT) and/or their nominee shall be subject to the directions of the IT Committee for the overall implementation of live streaming and recording of proceedings.

### 4. Personnel positioned in the Court:

In addition to the court master and court staff attached to the bench, technical expert(s) shall be appointed/deputed in each of the court premises or designated venue to enable the live streaming of proceedings. The technical expert(s) shall function under the overall supervision of the DCR.

### 5. Live streaming and Recording of Proceedings:

- 5.1. Subject to the exclusions contained within these rules, all proceedings will be live streamed by the court.
- 5.2. The following will be excluded from live streaming:—
  - i. Matrimonial matters, child adoption and child custody including transfer petitions arising thereunder.
  - ii. Cases concerning sexual offences, including proceedings instituted under section 376, Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC).
  - iii. Cases concerning gender-based violence against women.
  - iv. Matters registered under or involving the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO) and under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.
  - v. Matters registered under or involving the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971.



- 
- vi.** Matters registered under or involving the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971.
  - vii.** Matters where the bench is of the view, for reasons to be recorded in writing that publication would be antithetical to the administration of justice.
  - viii.** Cases, which in the opinion of the Bench, may provoke enmity amongst communities likely to result in a breach of law and order.
  - ix.** Recording of evidence, including cross-examination.
  - x.** Privileged communications between the parties and their advocates; cases where a claim of privilege is accepted by the Court; and non-public discussions between advocates.
  - xi.** Any other matter in which a specific direction is issued by the bench or the Chief Justice.
- 5.3.** Live streaming in certain cases may be restricted to final arguments.
- 5.4.** The court master/reader shall duly inform the parties, before the commencement of the proceedings, that the proceedings are being live streamed and that objections, if any, should be articulated at that juncture to the concerned bench.
- 5.5.** Objections, if any, to Live streaming may be raised at the time of institution of the case or any later stage. The final decision in that behalf shall be of the Bench:—
- i.** Objection to Live streaming, if any, shall be raised by the party by filing the form prescribed in Schedule-I.
  - ii.** A person objecting to Live streaming at a later stage, shall do so by filing the form prescribed in Schedule-II.
- 5.6.** The final decision as to whether to allow the live streaming of the proceedings or any portion thereof will be of the bench. However, the decision of the bench will be guided by the principle of an open and transparent judicial process. The decision of the Bench shall not be justiciable, provided that, in case of difference of opinion, the matter can be referred to a larger bench for a final decision.
- 5.7.** In cases where the proceedings are not live streamed, the recording shall be maintained for usage by the Court and the appellate court(s), subject to the following:—
- i.** Access to the recording of the testimony of witnesses will not be given until such time that the evidence is recorded in its entirety.
  - ii.** Transcript of the recordings would be made available to the advocate or litigant-in-person.
  - iii.** In case of litigant-in-person, who is also a witness in the matter, the bench in its discretion will decide as to the stage at which the litigant-in-person should have access to the recordings of the testimonies concerning the other witnesses in the matter.

**5.8.** In criminal matters, the testimony of victims and witnesses will be recorded for the exclusive use of the concerned bench and the appellate court(s), as per the direction issued in that behalf. The anonymity of the victims and witnesses shall be maintained in the recordings via dummy names, face-masking, pixelation and/or electronic distortion of voice, as and when directed by the court.

**5.9.** Audio-video recording or recording of proceedings by any other means, beyond the mandate of the present Rules is expressly prohibited.

## **6. Manner of Recording of Proceedings:**

**6.1.** The cameras in the Court shall be as per Rule 2.1.

**6.2.** Cameras shall not ordinarily audio-video record the media persons and the visitors present during the proceedings.

**6.3.** The following will ordinarily not be live streamed or saved in the archival data or transcribed:

- i.** Discussions between/amongst the judges on the bench.
- ii.** Instructions given by a judge to the administrative staff during the proceedings.
- iii.** Any communication/message/document given by the court master/reader to the bench.
- iv.** Documents given to the judge during the proceedings.
- v.** Notes taken down by the judge during the proceedings.
- vi.** Notes made by an advocate either on paper or in electronic form, for assistance, while making submissions before the bench.
- vii.** Communication between the advocate and client, *inter-se* the advocates and communication which is not a submission exchanged between the advocate and the court.

**6.4.** If one or more circumstances mentioned in Rule 6.3 occur, the monitor will display the message: “Live streaming paused as per applicable Rules”.

**6.5.** In case the judge concerned on the bench is desirous of opting out of live streaming while dictating the order/oral judgment, live streaming will be paused during that period. In such circumstances, the monitors will display a message: “Order-dictation in progress”. Likewise, when the bench rises for recess or otherwise, the live streaming will be paused and the monitor will display the message: “Court not in-session”.

## **7. Storage and Access:**

**7.1.** The recordings will be archived.

**7.2.** Recordings may be uploaded, wholly or in part, on the Courts’ website or made available on other digital platforms, as directed by the court.

7.3. Access to copies of the recordings not uploaded will be sanctioned by the designated officer, who will act as per law. An application for copies of recordings shall be made in the form prescribed in Schedule-III.

7.4. The archived data should ordinarily be retained by the court for atleast six months, subject to special directions issued by the concerned bench in a particular case. The Chief Justice may issue practice directions regarding the cases and the period for which archived data will be preserved. Archived data shall be stored in electronic devices in encrypted form with a specific hash (#) value.

## 8. Relay of Proceedings and Recordings:

### 8.1. General Precaution:—

Personal information such as date of birth of parties, home address, identity card number, bank account information and the personal information of related parties, such as close relatives, witnesses and other participants, will be deleted or muted during Live streaming. *Inter-alia*, any one of the masking techniques, as provided in rule 6.8, may be adopted. However, such Proceedings will be preserved in the archival data.

8.2. The advocates and litigants-in-person may request the bench to redact personal and sensitive information *inter-alia* of the kind referred to in Rule 8.1.

### 8.3. Relay of Proceedings:—

- i. Subject to limitations contained in these rules, the live stream shall commence as soon as the bench assembles and instructs the court staff to start the proceedings and shall end when the bench signals its conclusion for the day.
- ii. There shall be a delay of ten minutes in streaming, which may be changed as per the direction of the Court.
- iii. The live streaming shall be carried out from the designated venue as decided by the bench.

### 8.4. Relay of Recordings:—

The content of the recording will be vetted and shall be posted, usually within three days of the conclusion of the proceedings. The same shall be posted on the Courts' website or made available on such digital platforms, as directed by the court.

## 9. Disclaimers, Prohibitions and Restrictions:

### 9.1. Disclaimers:—

- i. The daily cause list published on the website of the court shall contain requisite information and disclaimer regarding live streaming.
- ii. The archival data shall not constitute the official record of the court proceedings unless otherwise directed by the bench.

### 9.2. Prohibitions and restrictions on usage of the recording or live stream:

- i. No person/entity (including print and electronic media and social media platforms) other than an authorised person/entity shall record, share and/or disseminate live streamed proceedings or archival data.

This provision shall also apply to all messaging applications. Any person/entity acting contrary to this provision will be prosecuted as per law. The court shall have the exclusive copyright in the recordings and archival Data.

Any unauthorised usage of the live stream will be punishable as an offence under the Indian Copyright Act, 1957, Information Technology Act, 2000 and other provisions of law, including the law of Contempt.

- ii. Any party/ litigant-in-person accessing the live stream will be bound by these Rules.
- iii. The live stream shall not, without the prior written authorisation of the Court, be reproduced, transmitted, uploaded, posted, modified, published or re-published in any form.
- iv. The use of authorised recordings in their original form may be permitted by the Court, *inter-alia* to disseminate news and for training, academic and educational purposes. Authorised recordings handed over for the aforesaid purposes shall not be further edited or processed. Such recordings will not be used for commercial, promotional purposes or advertising in any form.
- v. No person shall use a recording device for recording or for transcribing the proceedings, other than those authorised by the Court.

### **9.3. Use of communication device or recording device during proceedings:**

- i. A person must not use a communication device or a recording device to disturb proceedings in a manner that may cause concern to a witness or other participants in the proceedings or allow a person who is not a participant to receive information about the proceeding or the hearing to which the person is not otherwise entitled.
- ii. During proceedings, all personnel shall follow the instructions of the presiding judge, adhere to courtroom etiquettes and discipline and shall not engage in the following actions- audio and/or video recording, taking screenshots or using mobile communication tools to relay the proceedings.
- iii. Violation of Sub-Rules (i) and (ii) will result in prosecution as per law. Additionally, the bench may also direct seizure of the communication device or recording device.

## **10. Transcription and Access:**

**10.1.** Transcripts shall be prepared of recordings only when directed by the court.

**10.2.** The transcripts may be translated into other scheduled languages.

**10.3.** Recordings that are uploaded will be made accessible for differently abled persons.

## **11. Dedicated room(s) for live streaming:**

In order to decongest the court rooms, dedicated room(s) for viewing the live stream may be made available within the court premises. Access shall be given to law researchers, staff,

litigants, academicians and media personnel authorised to enter the court premises upon receipt of necessary permissions/approvals. Appropriate arrangements shall be made to enable viewing of live streams from multiple benches within this/these room(s). Special arrangements will be made for differently abled persons.

## **12. Power to Relax:**

The High Court may, if satisfied that the operation of any rule is causing undue hardship, by order, dispense with or relax the requirements of that Rule to such extent and subject to such conditions as may be stipulated to deal with the case in a just and equitable manner.

## **13. Reference to Words and Expressions:**

Words and expressions used and not defined in these rules shall have the same meaning as assigned to them by the law for the time being in force, including the Information Technology Act, 2000, CPC, the CrPC, Indian Evidence Act 1872, and the General Clauses Act, 1897.

## **14. Residual Provisions:**

Matters concerning which no express provision is made in these rules shall be decided by the Court consistent with the principle of furthering the interest of justice.

### **SCHEDULE-I**

#### **[Referred to in Rule 5(5)(i)]**

#### **Objection to live streaming of proceedings by filing Party**

1. Diary Number / Filing Number (if any):
2. Cause Title:
3. Reasons for objection to live streaming (please select one or more applicable). The case relates to:
  - i. Matrimonial matters, transfer petitions thereunder.
  - ii. Sexual offences, including proceedings instituted under section 376 of the IPC.
  - iii. Gender-based violence against women.
  - iv. POCSO and under The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.
  - v. In-camera proceedings as defined under section 327 of the CrPC or Section 153 B of the CPC.
  - vi. Publication would be antithetical to the administration of justice.
  - vii. Other(s) (state the reason briefly): \_\_\_\_\_
4. Applicant Details:

- i. Party name \_\_\_\_\_
- ii. Plaintiff/Petitioner/Appellant/Applicant No. \_\_\_\_\_
- iii. Applicant Address \_\_\_\_\_
- iv. Applicant Telephone number \_\_\_\_\_

I have read and understood the provisions of the Rules for live streaming for Courts (hyperlink). I undertake to remain bound by the same to the extent applicable to me.

Signature of the Applicant/Authorised signatory\*:

(this application may be e-signed)

Date:

Digital Signature/Scanned Signature

For use of the Registry

- A. Bench assigned:
  - B. Decision of the Bench: Allowed/Not
- Allowed Date:

## SCHEDULE-II

[Referred to in Rule 5(5)(ii)]

### Objection to live streaming of proceedings

1. Case Number / CNR Number / Diary Number (if any):
2. Cause Title:
3. Date of Hearing (if already listed) (DD/MM/YYYY):
4. Reasons for objection to the Live streaming (please select one or more applicable). Case relates to:
  - i. Matrimonial matters, transfer petitions thereunder.
  - ii. Sexual offences, including proceedings instituted under section 376 of the IPC.
  - iii. Gender-based violence against women.
  - iv. POCSO and under The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.
  - v. In-camera proceedings as defined under section 327 of the CrPC or Section 153 B of the CPC.

vi. Publication would be antithetical to the administration of justice.

vii. Other (s) (state the reason briefly): \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Applicant Details:**

i. Party name

ii. Select one:

a. [i] Petitioner No. [ii] Accused No. [iii] Plaintiff No.

b. [iv] Defendant No. [v] Application No. [vi] Respondent No. [vii] Deponent  
for No. \_\_\_\_\_ [viii] Other(s) \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Applicant Address \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Applicant Telephone number \_\_\_\_\_

I have read and understood the provisions of the Rules for live streaming for Courts (hyperlink). I undertake to remain bound by the same to the extent applicable to me.

Signature of the Applicant/Authorised Signatory\*:

(this application may be e-signed)

Date:

Digital Signature/Scanned Signature

For the use of the Registry

A. Bench assigned:

B. Decision of the Bench: Allowed/Not

Allowed Date:

**SCHEDULE-III**

**[Referred to in Rule 7.3]**

**APPLICATION FORM FOR COPIES OF RECORDINGS AVAILABLE IN  
ARCHIVAL DATA**

1. Case Number / CNR Number (if any):

2. Cause Title:

3. Cause Title:

**4. Applicant Status (select one):**

- i.** Party to the proceedings
- ii.** Authorised Representative
- iii.** Advocate for the Party /
- iv.** Third Party /None of the above (Please Specify)

**5. Identification document enclosed: (i) Bar Association ID (ii) Aadhaar Card (iii) Pan Card (iv) Driver's License (v) Ration Card (vi) Other Government issued ID (please specify):****6. ID Number:** \_\_\_\_\_**7. Applicant Address:** \_\_\_\_\_**8. Applicant Telephone number:** \_\_\_\_\_**9. Reason/(s) for requesting access:** \_\_\_\_\_**10. Format in which Recording is requested: (i) Cloud link (ii) Physical Drive****11. Fee to be Paid:**

[Subject to fee as prescribed by the concerned High Court.]

I have read and understood the provisions of the rules for live streaming for Courts (hyperlink). I undertake to remain bound by the same to the extent applicable to me. I undertake not to copy, distribute or publish, or cause the copying, distribution or publication of the Recordings in any manner without the prior written approval of the Court.

Signature of the Applicant/Authorised Signatory\*:

(this application may be e-signed)

Date:

Digital Signature/Scanned Signature

For the use of the Registry

WHETHER APPROVED BY DESIGNATED OFFICER

Fee paid:

**HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001**

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 1st April, 2023*

**No. HHC/GAZ/14-386/2018.**—Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice has been pleased to grant *ex-post facto* sanction of 03 days' commuted leave *w.e.f.* 19-07-2022 to 21-07-2022, 01 day earned



leave for 10-09-2022, further 20 days commuted leave *w.e.f.* 11-09-2022 to 30-09-2022 and 11 days' commuted leave *w.e.f.* 30-01-2023 to 09-02-2023, in favour of Ms. Isha Agrawal, Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Nurpur, presently under transfer as Civil Judge *cum*-JMFC (IV), Una.

Certified that Ms. Isha Agrawal had joined the same post and at the same station from where she proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Ms. Isha Agrawal would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Nurpur, H.P., but for her proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,

*Registrar General.*

---

## HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 1st April, 2023*

**No. HHC/GAZ/14-366/2015.**—Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice has been pleased to grant 11 days' earned leave *w.e.f.* 01-04-2023 to 11-04-2023 in favour of Sh. Vishal Tiwari, Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC-II, Amb, Distt. Una, H.P.

Certified that Sh. Vishal Tiwari is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Vishal Tiwari would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC-II, Amb, Distt. Una, H.P., but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,

*Registrar General.*

---

## HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 1st April, 2023*

**No. HHC/GAZ/14-408/2020.**—Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice has been pleased to grant *ex-post facto* sanction of 10 days' commuted leave *w.e.f.* 15-12-2022 to 24-12-2022 in favour of Ms. Ritu Sinha, Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Palampur.

Certified that Ms. Ritu Sinha had joined the same post and at the same station from where she had proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Ms. Ritu Sinha would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge-cum-JMFC, Palampur, but for her proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,

*Registrar General.*

## HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 1st April, 2023*

**No. HHC/Admn.6 (23)/74-XVII.**—Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in her under Rule 2 (32) of Chapter 1 of H.P. Financial Rules, 2009 has been pleased to declare Additional District and Sessions Judge (I), Solan, H.P. as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of Additional District and Sessions Judge (2), Solan, H.P. and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of salary, T.A. etc. in respect of establishment attached to the aforesaid Court under Major head "2014 Administration of Justice" till the posting/joining of new Presiding Officer in aforesaid Court.

By order,

*Registrar General.*

## HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA -171 001

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 28th March, 2023*

**No. HHC/GAZ/ 14-258/2003.**—Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice has been pleased to grant 07 days earned leave *w.e.f.* 31-03-2023 to 06-04-2023 with permission to prefix 30-03-2023 (being Ram Navami) and suffix 07-04-2023 to 09-04-2023 (being Good Friday, Second Saturday and Sunday) and to leave the station from 29-03-2023 (after office hours) to 10-04-2023 (before office hours) in favour of Sh. Avinash Chander, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Nalagarh, H.P.

Certified that Sh. Avinash Chander is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Avinash Chander would have continued to hold the post of Additional District and Sessions Judge, Nalagarh, H.P., but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,

*Registrar General.*

## विधि विभाग

## अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 24 अप्रैल, 2023

**संख्या : एल0एल0आर0-ई(9)-5/2013-लेज.**—क्योंकि श्री देश राज ठाकुर, अधिवक्ता को इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या : एल0एल0आर0-ई(9)-31/2005-लेज, तारीख 09-12-2011 द्वारा नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया था और उनको उप-मण्डल सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी की क्षेत्रीय सीमाओं के भीतर व्यवसाय करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया गया था और उनका नाम नोटरी के रजिस्टर में क्रम संख्या 398 पर प्रविष्ट किया गया था;

और क्योंकि श्री देश राज ठाकुर के पक्ष में जारी व्यवसाय प्रमाण-पत्र दिनांक 05-01-2020 को समाप्त हो गया था और उन्होंने दो साल से अधिक समय बीत जाने के बाद भी लाइसेंस के नवीनीकरण के लिए आवेदन नहीं किया था। उन्हें नोटरी नियम, 1956 के नियम 8बी के प्रावधानों के अनुसार नियत तारीख की समाप्ति से छः महीने पहले इसके नवीनीकरण के लिए आवेदन करना आवश्यक था। उन्हें लाइसेंस का नवीनीकरण न करने के लिए 1 फरवरी, 2020 को कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था। नियम के अनुसार, उनके प्रमाण-पत्र की वैधता समाप्त होने के बाद वह नोटरी नहीं रहा था। इस कारण बताओ नोटिस के जबाब में उसने कहा कि उसकी माँ की गंभीर बीमारी के कारण वह समय पर आवेदन नहीं कर सका। उस समय, उनके जबाब पर सहानुभूतिपूर्वक विचार किया गया था और उन्हें सशर्त रूप से अपने अभ्यास के प्रमाण-पत्र को नवीनीकृत करने की अनुमति दी गई थी और उन्हें पांच साल की अवधि के लिए लाइसेंस के नवीनीकरण के लिए आवेदन करने के लिए दिनांक 7 मार्च, 2022 को पंजीकृत डाक द्वारा निर्देशित किया गया था। लेकिन, उन्होंने न तो इस पत्र का जवाब दिया और न ही लाइसेंस के नवीनीकरण के लिए आवेदन किया। तत्पश्चात, उन्होंने 26-12-2022 को अपने नोटरी रिकॉर्ड की जांच कराई है। रिकॉर्ड को खंगालने पर पता चला कि वह नोटरी के पद से हटने के बाद भी नोटरी के रूप में काम कर रहा है और दस्तावेजों को प्रमाणित कर रहा है, जो एक पेशेवर कदाचार है। उसने अपने नोटरी रिकॉर्ड के निरीक्षण के समय अधिकारी/कर्मचारी को यह कह कर गुमराह किया कि उसका प्रमाण पत्र 05-01-2023 तक वैध है।

और क्योंकि श्री देश राज ठाकुर को इस विभाग के ज्ञापन सम संख्या दिनांक 31 जनवरी, 2023 के माध्यम से इस मामले में अपना पक्ष रखने का अवसर प्रदान किया गया था। चूंकि, इस ज्ञापन के संदर्भ में उन्होंने जबाब दिया है, जिसे संतोषजनक नहीं पाया गया, इसलिए, इस विभाग के आदेश दिनांक 06-04-2023 द्वारा इसे अस्वीकृत कर दिया था। उपरोक्त को ध्यान में रखते हुए, नोटरी का नवीनीकरण मामला नोटरी अधिनियम, 1952 और पूर्वोक्त नियमों के किसी भी प्रावधान के अंतर्गत नहीं आता है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, नोटरी अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 10(च) के साथ पठित नोटरी नियम, 1956 के नियम 13(13) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री देश राज ठाकुर, नोटरी, उप-मण्डल सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी का नाम नोटरी के रजिस्टर से तुरन्त हटाए जाने का आदेश करते हैं।

आदेश द्वारा,  
शरद कुमार लगवाल,  
विधिपरामर्शी एवं सचिव (विधि)।

*[Authoritative English text of this Department Notification No. LLR-E(9)-5/2013-Leg. Dated 24 -04-2023 as required under Article 348(3) of the Constitution of India].*

## LAW DEPARTMENT

## NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 24 April, 2023

**No. LLR-E(9)-5/2013-Leg.**—WHEREAS, Shri Desh Raj Thakur, Advocate was appointed as Notary vide Notification No. LLR-E(9)-31/2005-Leg., dated 09-12-2011 and authorized to practice

as such within the territorial limits of Sub-Division Sarkaghat of District Mandi and his name was entered at Serial No. **398** in the Register of Notaries;

AND WHEREAS, the Certificate of Practice issued in favour of Shri Desh Raj Thakur had expired on 05-01-2020 and he had not applied for renewal of license even after the lapse of more than two years. He was required to apply for its renewal well before six months from the expiry of due date as per the provisions of Rule 8B of the Notaries Rules, 1956. He was issued show cause notice on 1st February, 2020 for non-renewal of licence. As per rule, he was ceased to be a notary after expiry of validity of his certificate. In reply to this show cause notice, he submitted that due to serious illness of his mother he could not apply well in time. At that time, his reply was considered sympathetically and he was conditionally allowed to get his certificate of practice renewed and he was directed by registered post on dated 7th March, 2022 to apply for renewal of licence for further period of five years. But, he did neither replied to this letter and nor applied for renewal of licence. Thereafter, on 26-12-2022, he has got examined his notarial record. On going through record, it was found that he is still working as Notary and attesting documents after he was ceased to be notary, which is a professional misconduct. He has also misled the officer/official at the time of inspection of his notarial record by stating that his certificate is valid up to 05-01-2023.

AND WHEREAS, Sh. Desh Raj Thakur was afforded an opportunity to make submissions, if any, in the matter *vide* Memorandum of even number dated 31st January, 2023. In his reply, he has submitted that he did not receive any letter issued by this department for renewal of licence. Since, the reply submitted by him to the said Memorandum was not found satisfactory, therefore, the same was rejected *vide* order dated 6th April, 2023. In view of above, renewal case of the notary is not covered under any provisions of the Notaries Act, 1952 and rules *ibid*.

NOW THEREFORE, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(f) of the Notaries Act, 1952 and Rule 13(13) of the Notaries Rules, 1956, hereby orders the removal of the name of Shri Desh Raj Thakur, Notary, Sub-Division Sarkaghat of District Mandi from the Register of Notaries with immediate effect.

By order,  
SHARAD KUMAR LAGWAL,  
*LR-cum- Secretary (Law).*

राजस्व विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171002, 25 अप्रैल, 2023

**संख्या: रैव डी (जी) 6-12/2016.**—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश ग्राम शामिलता भूमि निधान और उपयोग अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 18) की धारा 13 और हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-जोत अधिकतम सीमा अधिनियम, 1972 (1973 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 19) की धारा 26 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश पट्टा नियम, 2013 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाने का प्रस्ताव करते हैं और इन्हें सर्वसाधारण की सामान्य जानकारी के लिए राजपत्र (ई-गजट), हिमाचल प्रदेश में एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करते हैं;

यदि नियमों की बाबत इस संशोधन द्वारा सम्भाव्य प्रभावित होने वाले किसी व्यक्ति के पास कोई आक्षेप या सुझाव है, तो वह उसे/उन्हें इस प्रारूप नियमों के राजपत्र (ई-गजट), हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशन

की तारीख से तीस दिन की अवधि के भीतर प्रधान सचिव (राजस्व), हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार, शिमला-171002 को भेज सकेगा;

उपरोक्त विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि के भीतर प्राप्त आक्षेप/सुझाव यदि कोई हैं, पर इन नियमों को अन्तिम रूप देने से पूर्व सरकार द्वारा सम्यक् रूप से विचार किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

### प्रारूप नियम

1. **संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.**—इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश पट्टा (संशोधन) नियम, 2023 है।

2. ये नियम राजपत्र (ई-गजट), हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. **नियम 7 का संशोधन.**—हिमाचल प्रदेश पट्टा नियम, 2013 के नियम 7 में, पहले परन्तुक के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“परन्तु राज्य सरकार किसी भी दशा में 40 वर्ष से अधिक की अवधि के लिए पट्टे पर भूमि प्रदान नहीं करेगी।”

आदेश द्वारा,  
ओंकार चंद शर्मा,  
प्रधान सचिव (राजस्व)।

*[Authoritative English text of this Department's Notification No. Rev-D (G) 6-12/2016, dated 25-04-2023 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].*

## REVENUE DEPARTMENT

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla-171002, the 25th April, 2023*

**No. Rev-D (G) 6-12/2016.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 13 of the Himachal Pradesh Village Common Lands Vesting and Utilization Act, 1974 (Act No 18 of 1974) and Section 26 of the Himachal Pradesh Ceiling on Land Holdings Act, 1972 (Act No. 19 of 1973), the Governor of Himachal Pradesh proposes to make the following rules further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Lease Rules, 2013 and the same are hereby published in Rajpatra (e-Gazette), Himachal Pradesh for general information of the public;

If any person likely to be affected by this amendment has any objection (s) or suggestion(s) to make in respect of these rules, he may send the same to the Principal Secretary (Revenue) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-171002 within 30 days from the date of publication of these draft rules in Rajpatra (e-Gazette), Himachal Pradesh;

Objection(s) or suggestion(s), if any, received within the period specified above, shall be considered by the State Government before finalizing these rules, namely:—

### Draft Rules

1. **Short title and commencement.**—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Lease (Amendment) Rules, 2023.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of publication in Rajpatra(e-Gazette), Himachal Pradesh.

**2. Amendment of rule 7.**—In rule 7 of the Himachal Pradesh Lease Rules, 2013, for the first proviso the following shall be substituted namely:—

“Provided that the State Government shall not grant the lease of land in any case for a period exceeding 40 years.”

By order

ONKAR CHAND SHARMA,  
Principal Secretary (Revenue).

समक्ष श्री बन्सी राम शर्मा सहायक समाहर्ता (द्वितीय वर्ग), तहसील ददाहू, जिला सिरमौर  
(हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं० : 16/9 of 2023

तारीख पेशी : 27-04-2023

उनवान मुकद्दमा : तकसीम श्री विनय सिंह नेगी बनाम गउ सिंह आदि।

सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि वादी श्री विनय सिंह नेगी पुत्र श्री अमर सिंह, निवासी देहरू निवास, गांव व डा० बुलिया, तहसील व जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) ने भूमि खाता खतौनी नं० 39/46, खसरा नं० 729/49, रकबा तादादी 48-10-00 बीघा, स्थित मौजा चोरटिया बनोगटा, तहसील ददाहू के विभाजन हेतु (हि०प्र०) भू राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 123 के अन्तर्गत आवेदन किया है। इस मुकद्दमा में शामिल प्रतिवादी नं० 1. गउ सिंह, प्रतिवादी नं० 2. राजेश पुत्र व प्रतिवादी नं० 3. श्रीमती जय देवी, प्रतिवादी नं० 4. श्रीमती प्रमीला, प्रतिवादी नं० 5. श्रीमती रमिला पुत्री व प्रतिवादी नं० 6. श्रीमती हीर देवी पत्नी श्री हरी चन्द, प्रतिवादी नं० 7. अभय पुत्र, प्रतिवादी नं० 8. अंजली व प्रतिवादी नं० 9. शिवानी पुत्री व प्रतिवादी नं० 10. श्रीमती इन्दू बाला पत्नी श्री कपिल देव, प्रतिवादी नं० 11. रण बहादुर व प्रतिवादी नं० 12. तुला राम व प्रतिवादी नं० 13. शेर सिंह पुत्र व प्रतिवादी नं० 14. माता राम व प्रतिवादी नं० 15. रूप सिंह पुत्र प्रतिवादी नं० 16. रूप देवी पुत्री बहादुर सिंह समस्त प्रतिवादीगण निवासी चोरटिया बनोगटा, तहसील ददाहू, प्रतिवादी नं० 17. सरकार हि०प्र० लोक निर्माण विभाग, उप-मण्डल ददाहू को बार-बार साधारण व पंजीकृत डाक द्वारा समन जारी होने के कारण असालतन न होने पाई जा रही है, जिस कारण इस अदालत को यकीन हो गया है कि इनकी तामील साधारण तरीके से होनी सम्भव नहीं है।

अतः उपरोक्त सभी प्रतिवादीगणों को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन व वकालतन आगामी निर्धारित तारीख पेशी 27-04-2023 को इस अदालत हजा में हाजिर होकर अपना पक्ष रखें। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में कार्यवाही एकतरफा अमल में लाई जाएगी तथा इस प्रकरण में आगामी कार्यवाही नियमानुसार की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 28-03-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय की मोहर से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

बन्सी राम शर्मा,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
तहसील ददाहू, जिला सिरमौर (हि०प्र०)।

समक्ष श्री बन्सी राम शर्मा सहायक समाहर्ता (द्वितीय वर्ग), तहसील ददाहू, जिला सिरमौर  
(हि०प्र०)

मिसल नं० : 17/9 of 2023

तारीख पेशी : 27-04-2023

उनवान मुकद्दमा : तकसीम श्री विनय सिंह नेगी बनाम गउ सिंह आदि।

सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि वादी श्री विनय सिंह नेगी पुत्र श्री अमर सिंह, निवासी देहरू निवास, गांव व डा० बुलिया, तहसील व जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) ने भूमि खाता

खतौनी नं० 40/47, खसरा नं० 492, रकबा तादादी 180-10-00 बीघा, स्थित मौजा चोरटिया बनोगटा, तहसील ददाहू के विभाजन हेतु (हि०प्र०) भू राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 123 के अन्तर्गत आवेदन किया है। इस मुकद्दमा में शामिल प्रतिवादी नं० 1. गउ सिंह, प्रतिवादी नं० 2. राजेश पुत्र व प्रतिवादी नं० 3. श्रीमती जय देवी, प्रतिवादी नं० 4. श्रीमती प्रमीला, प्रतिवादी नं० 5. श्रीमती रमिला पुत्री व प्रतिवादी नं० 6. श्रीमती हीर देवी पत्नी श्री हरी चन्द, प्रतिवादी नं० 7. अभय पुत्र, प्रतिवादी नं० 8. अंजली व प्रतिवादी नं० 9. शिवानी पुत्री व प्रतिवादी नं० 10. श्रीमती इन्दू बाला पत्नी श्री कपिल देव, प्रतिवादी नं० 11. रण बहादुर व प्रतिवादी नं० 12. तुला राम व प्रतिवादी नं० 13. शेर सिंह पुत्र व प्रतिवादी नं० 14. माता राम व प्रतिवादी नं० 15. रूप सिंह पुत्र प्रतिवादी नं० 16. रूप देवी पुत्री बहादुर सिंह समस्त प्रतिवादीगण निवासी चोरटिया बनोगटा, तहसील ददाहू, प्रतिवादी नं० 17. सरकार हि०प्र० लोक निर्माण विभाग, उप-मण्डल ददाहू को बार-बार साधारण व पंजीकृत डाक द्वारा समन जारी होने के कारण असालतन न होने पाई जा रही है, जिस कारण इस अदालत को यकीन हो गया है कि इनकी तामिल साधारण तरीके से होनी सम्भव नहीं है।

अतः उपरोक्त सभी प्रतिवादीगणों को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन व वकालतन आगामी निर्धारित तारीख पेशी 27-04-2023 को इस अदालत हजा में हाजिर होकर अपना पक्ष रखें। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में कार्यवाही एकतरफा अमल में लाई जाएगी तथा इस प्रकरण में आगामी कार्यवाही नियमानुसार की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 28-03-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय की मोहर से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

बन्सी राम शर्मा,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
तहसील ददाहू, जिला सिरमौर (हि०प्र०)।

ब अदालत नवीन कुमार सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील कमरऊ,  
जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)

केस नं० : 03/2023

दायर तिथि : 07-03-2023

जगदीश पुत्र जुंगलू निवासी ग्राम घैलाओं, डा० टटियाणा, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि०प्र०)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37(1) के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री जगदीश पुत्र जुंगलू, निवासी ग्राम घैलाओं, डा० टटियाणा, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि०प्र०) ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र मय अपने प्रमाण-पत्र नकल जमाबन्दी, मौजा टटियाणा, परिवार नकल ग्राम पंचायत टटियाणा एवं आधार कार्ड प्रति सहित इस कार्यालय में प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें प्रार्थी ने प्रार्थना की है कि उसका अपना नाम जोकि मुताबिक परिवार नकल ग्राम पंचायत टटियाणा एवं आधार कार्ड अनुसार राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त टटियाणा में जोगी राम पुत्र जुंगलू की जगह सही नाम जोगी राम उर्फ जगदीश पुत्र जुंगलू राम दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 08-05-2023 या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा स्थित कमरऊ में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है अन्यथा उजर/एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में उक्त नाम दुरुस्ती राजस्व अभिलेख में करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-03-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत नवीन कुमार कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 : 01/2023

दायर तिथि : 07-03-2023

खजान सिंह पुत्र चानण सिंह, निवासी ग्राम पभार, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

प्रार्थी श्री खजान सिंह पुत्र चानण सिंह, निवासी ग्राम पभार, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का एक आवेदन-पत्र द्वारा मुख्य रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु/मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी नाहन के पत्र संख्या एच0 एफ0 डब्ल्यू0-एन0/एस0टी0/बी0 एण्ड डी0/डिलेड केसिस/2023-10238 दिनांक 15-02-2023 द्वारा अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, दो गवाहान ब्यान हल्फी, प्रपत्र 10 सचिव ग्राम पंचायत जामना, 10वीं की अंक तालिका, आधार कार्ड प्रति, प्रधान ग्राम पंचायत जामना द्वारा जारी प्रमाण-पत्र एवं परिवार नकल सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी पुत्री का नाम रीतिका व जन्म तिथि 10-03-2004 है, जिसका अज्ञानतावश प्रार्थी अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि का इन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत पभार के जन्म अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवा सका है। जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। रीतिका की माता का नाम शीला देवी है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 08-05-2023 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी कार्यदिवस को अदालत हजा स्थित कमरऊ में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर उजर/एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि या इसके पूर्व में कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र खजान सिंह पुत्र चानण सिंह, निवासी ग्राम पभार, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर, हि0प्र0 के प्रकरण पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 23-03-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर, हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत नवीन कुमार कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 : 02/2023

दायर तिथि : 07-03-2023

चन्दर सिंह पुत्र खजान सिंह, निवासी ग्राम टटियाणा, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता



प्रार्थना-पत्र जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

प्रार्थी श्री चन्दर सिंह पुत्र खजान सिंह, निवासी ग्राम टटियाणा, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का एक आवेदन-पत्र द्वारा मुख्य रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु/मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी नाहन के पत्र संख्या एच0 एफ0 डब्ल्यू0-एन0/एस0टी0/बी0 एण्ड डी0/डिलेड केसिस/2023-10365 दिनांक 17-02-2023 द्वारा अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, दो गवाहन ब्यान हल्फी, प्रपत्र 10 सचिव ग्राम पंचायत टटियाणा, सेवा प्रमाण-पत्र, स्कूल द्वारा जारी प्रमाण-पत्र, स्कूल छोड़ने का प्रमाण-पत्र, प्रधान ग्राम पंचायत टटियाणा द्वारा जारी प्रमाण-पत्र एवं नकल परिवार रजिस्टर, आधार कार्ड प्रति सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 06-02-1994 है, जिसका अज्ञानतावश प्रार्थी अपनी जन्म तिथि का इन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत टटियाणा के जन्म अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवा सका है। जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। चन्द्र सिंह की माता का नाम सत्या देवी है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 08-05-2023 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी कार्यदिवस में अदालत हजा स्थित कमरऊ में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर उजर/एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि या इसके पूर्व में कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र चन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री खजान सिंह, निवासी ग्राम टटियाणा, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर, हि0प्र0 के प्रकरण पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 23-03-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर, हि0 प्र0।

### ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार), नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

श्री जसवंत सिंह पुत्र श्री उदय राम, निवासी ग्राम चोरटिया बगनोटा, डा0 महीपुर, तहसील ददाहू, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम  
आम जनता

प्रार्थी श्री जसवंत सिंह पुत्र श्री उदय राम, निवासी ग्राम चोरटिया बगनोटा, डा0 महीपुर, तहसील ददाहू, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत करके आवेदन किया है कि उसके चाचा श्री चुहड सिंह की मृत्यु तिथि 30-05-1990 है, जोकि ग्राम पंचायत नेहली धीडा, तहसील नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है। जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 08-05-2023 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर/एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो उक्त श्री चुहड सिंह की मृत्यु तिथि 30-05-1990 ग्राम पंचायत नेहली धीडा, तहसील नाहन में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 03-04-2023 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (तहसीलदार),  
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत नवीन कुमार सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील कमरऊ,  
जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 04/2023

दायर तिथि : 15-03-2023

भजू राम पुत्र मोहतू निवासी ग्राम पैदुआ, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र भू-राजस्व अधिनियम की धारा 37(1) के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री भजू राम पुत्र मोहतू निवासी ग्राम पैदुआ, तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र मय ब्यान, नकल जमाबन्दी, मौजा गाब्बर, परिवार नकल ग्राम पंचायत भजौन एवं आधार कार्ड प्रति सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थी ने प्रार्थना की है कि उसका नाम जोकि मुताबिक परिवार नकल ग्राम पंचायत भजौन, ब्यान हल्फी व आधार कार्ड अनुसार राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त भजौन में भजनू पुत्र मोहतू की जगह सही नाम भजनू उर्फ भजू राम पुत्र मोहतू दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 12-05-2023 या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा स्थित कमरऊ में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है अन्यथा उजर/एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में उक्त नाम दुरुस्ती राजस्व अभिलेख में करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 29-03-2023 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
तहसील कमरऊ, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।